Entered on Docket
July 19, 2005
GLORIA L. FRANKLIN, CLERK
U.S BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



1	
1	

2

3 4

5 6

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Signed and Filed: July 19, 2005

THOMAS E. CARLSON

THOMAS E. CARLSON U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10	In re) Case No: 02-31521 TC
11	ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,)
12	Debtor.) Chapter 7
13	Deptol.)
14	ALEXIS MAGER LAKUSTA,	Adv. Proc. No. 03-3549 TC
15	Plaintiff,) Adv. Floc. No. 03 3349 10
16	vs.) Date: July 22, 2005) Time: 9:30 a.m.
17	MARK H. EVANS,) Ctrm: Hon. Thomas E. Carlson) 235 Pine Street
18	Defendant.) San Francisco, CA
19	Defendant.)
20)

MEMORANDUM RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AMENDMENT OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 60 (b)

Plaintiff Alexis Lakusta filed and set for hearing a motion seeking reconsideration of this court's June 8, 2005 judgment in the above-entitled action.

Plaintiff asserts that this court erred in determining that the present lawsuit was barred under a prior settlement agreement, because that settlement agreement was intended to resolve a prior

MEMORANDUM RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AMENDMENT OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 60(b) -1-

lawsuit, not the present lawsuit. This argument is unpersuasive because the settlement agreement, which arose out of the same transaction at issue in the present lawsuit, contained a release of all known and unknown claims.

Plaintiff also asserts that the form of judgment submitted by Defendant's counsel and later entered by the court was not properly served upon Plaintiff and his counsel. This argument is unpersuasive. The proposed form of judgment was served on Plaintiff's counsel, and the judgment entered properly reflects the court's decision.

The other grounds for relief raised in Plaintiff's motion do not represent newly discovered evidence that could not have been presented at the original trial, fraud upon the court, or any other ground for relief from judgment recognized in Rule 60(b).

The court need not address whether Plaintiff has standing to bring this motion without joinder by the chapter 7 trustee.

Oral argument could not cure the deficiencies in the motion, would not be helpful to the court, and would only increase the cost of these proceedings.

END OF MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR AMENDMENT OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 60(b) -2-

1	<u>Court Service List</u>
2	
3 4	Alexis Mager Lakusta 1259 El Camino Real, #245 Menlo Park, CA 94025
5	Catherine Schlomann Robertson, Esq. Law Offices of Pahl & Gosselin
6 7	160 West Santa Clara Street, 14th Fl. San Jose, CA 95113-1700
8	Charles E. Sims P.O. Box 1247 Sonoma, CA 95476
9	333 Market Street, 25th Fl.
11	San Francisco, CA 94105-2130
12	
13	
14	
15	
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	